RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Kimberly H Tilley (CN=Kimberly H Tilley/O=OVP [OVP])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1997 12:03:01.00

SUBJECT: Re: VP and the HOPE Scholarships

TO: Kris M Balderston (CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
We're happy to take a look at this. Do you have any paper?

Kris M Balderston @ EOP

03/17/97 11:58 AM

To: Kimberly H Tilley/OVP

cc:

Subject: VP and the HOPE Scholarships

As if you need more requests for taking the VP's time -- but I'll give it a shot anyway.

The NEC may be talking to you about this but the Education Department will be sending the HOPE scholarship legislation to the Hill on Thursday, March 20. Riley wants to know if the VPOTUS will be available for an event.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa A. Berg (CN=Lisa A. Berg/O=OVP [OVP])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1997 15:20:21.00

SUBJECT: Re: Possible Atlanta Trip

TO: Toby Donenfeld (CN=Toby Donenfeld/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Ansley Jones (CN=Ansley Jones/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Karen E. Skelton (CN=Karen E. Skelton/OU=Who/O=Eop @ Eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Kimberly H Tilley (CN=Kimberly H Tilley/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Maurice Daniel (CN=Maurice Daniel/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Moe Vela (CN=Moe Vela/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
The higher end would be approximately $5,500.00 plus event costs. You

should know in the back of your mind that it may come in for less.

Toby Donenfeld

06/17/97 02:42 PM

Re: Possible Atlanta Trip

I'm confused. How much are we asking the Department of Education for?

Lisa A. Berg 06/17/97 01:41 PM

To: Ansley Jones/OVP

cc: Moe Vela/OVP, Maurice Daniel/OVP, Kimberly H Tilley/OVP, Toby Donenfeld/OVP, Karen E. Skelton/WHO/EOP @ EOP

Subject: Re: Possible Atlanta Trip

Let me clarify. When we have multiple event hosts and add on meetings of our own (outreach etc) NOT related to either of the official events (ie. adding on a meeting with business leaders) that adds a THIRD component to his time, and therefore a third entity must assume responsibility for that portion of the trip. That could be a third host, or OVP or whatever is deemed appropriate. But we need to recognize this is one third of the travel and advance costs of the trip.

So while Ansley's note below indicates that the payment should work out with the Scholarship event and NEA, we need to discuss adding on any additional meetings. Thanks.

Subject: Possible Atlanta Trip

I spoke with Moe about costs for the trip. Assuming we do an Education/ Hope Scholarship event with Gov. Miller, a speech to NEA and two offiicial meetings (if no cost of room rental), the total cost of the trip would be approximately $11,000 (for event, advance and travel total costs), which means DOE and NEA would need to pay ~ $5,500 each. We are still waiting on confirmation from Maurice about the NEA event.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Toby Donenfeld (CN=Toby Donenfeld/O=OVP [OVP])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1997 14:42:01.00

SUBJECT: Re: Possible Atlanta Trip

TO: Lisa A. Berg (CN=Lisa A. Berg/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jonathan H. Schnur (CN=Jonathan H. Schnur/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Karen E. Skelton (CN=Karen E. Skelton/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Kimberly H Tilley (CN=Kimberly H Tilley/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Maurice Daniel (CN=Maurice Daniel/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Moe Vela (CN=Moe Vela/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Toby Donenfeld (CN=Toby Donenfeld/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
I'm confused. How much are we asking the Department of Education for?

Lisa A. Berg 06/17/97 01:41 PM

To: Ansley Jones/OVP

cc: Moe Vela/OVP, Maurice Daniel/OVP, Kimberly H Tilley/OVP, Toby

Donenfeld/OVP, Karen E. Skelton/WHO/EOP @ EOP

Subject: Re: Possible Atlanta Trip

Let me clarify. When we have multiple event hosts and add on meetings of our own (outreach etc) NOT related to either of the official events (ie. adding on a meeting with business leaders) that adds a THIRD component to his time, and therefore a third entity must assume responsibility for that portion of the trip. That could be a third host, or OVP or whatever is deemed appropriate. But we need to recognize this is one third of the travel and advance costs of the trip.

So while Ansley's note below indicates that the payment should work out with the Scholarship event and NEA, we need to discuss adding on any additional meetings. Thanks.

Subject: Possible Atlanta Trip

I spoke with Moe about costs for the trip. Assuming we do an Education/ Hope Scholarship event with Gov. Miller, a speech to NEA and two offiicial meetings (if no cost of room rental), the total cost of the trip would be approximately $11,000 (for event, advance and travel total costs), which means DOE and NEA would need to pay ~ $5,500 each. We are still waiting on confirmation from Maurice about the NEA event.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ansley Jones (CN=Ansley Jones/O=OVP [OVP])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-JUL-1997 19:15:59.00

SUBJECT: options for the 8th

TO: Ellen L. Ochs (CN=Ellen L. Ochs/O=OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eric R. Anderson (CN=Eric R. Anderson/O=OVP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicholas R. Baldick (CN=Nicholas R. Baldick/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Florida is not out. plan couldn't be higlighted enough.

---------------------- Forwarded by Ansley Jones/OVP on 07/01/97 07:25 PM

Ansley Jones

07/01/97 07:15 PM

To: Ron Klain/OVP, Lorraine A. Voles/OVP, Virginia M. Terzano/OVP

cc: Jonathan H. Schnur/OVP, Lisa A. Berg/OVP, Maurice Daniel/OVP,

Michael B. Feldman/OVP, Steven W. Adamske/OVP

Subject: options for the 8th

According to the Dept of Education there are several good options for VP visits to highlight the President's tax/ budget plan. They really want the VP to talk about the benefits of the 20% tax credits. Below are the following recommendations. If everyone agrees, I think we should go with Pittsburgh, PA. (We need to make a decision so we can get this going. Thanks!)

1. Pitts, PA -- the Univ. of Pitts. (this is Education's Top Choice)

* 4 year public univ. with high tuition costs

* VP would talk about the 20-% tax credit and the Hope Scholarship

* there are a number of community colleges in PA with relatively low tuitions, so the VP can really highlight why our plan is better.

* High number of part-time students, so we can talk about how our package helps working Americans go back to school part-time to get the skills they need to succeed in the workplace.

2. Univ. of Connecticut at Tolland County

* 4 year public with high tuition, again showing benefits of 20% tax credit

* Community college is close by with reasonable, but not low tuition costs, so this would show HOPE well (but not as well as PA)

3. Univ. of Louisville, KY --

* 4 year public univ. is higher than other states with low cost community colleges

* there are community colleges close by with low tuiton costs, so we could highlight HOPE Scholarships and isn't terrible on 20% tax credit

* Friendly Governor who would like us to do an education event

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ansley Jones (CN=Ansley Jones/O=OVP [OVP])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-JUL-1997 09:43:36.00

SUBJECT: options for the 8th

TO: Christopher J. Lavery (CN=Christopher J. Lavery/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
We should make a decision by 10am. i'll let you know. thanks

---------------------- Forwarded by Ansley Jones/OVP on 07/02/97 09:53 AM

Ansley Jones

07/01/97 07:15 PM

To: Ron Klain/OVP, Lorraine A. Voles/OVP, Virginia M. Terzano/OVP

cc: Jonathan H. Schnur/OVP, Lisa A. Berg/OVP, Maurice Daniel/OVP,

Michael B. Feldman/OVP, Steven W. Adamske/OVP

Subject: options for the 8th

According to the Dept of Education there are several good options for VP visits to highlight the President's tax/ budget plan. They really want the VP to talk about the benefits of the 20% tax credits. Below are the following recommendations. If everyone agrees, I think we should go with Pittsburgh, PA. (We need to make a decision so we can get this going. Thanks!)

1. Pitts, PA -- the Univ. of Pitts. (this is Education's Top Choice)

    * 4 year public univ. with high tuition costs

* VP would talk about the 20-% tax credit and the Hope Scholarship

* there are a number of community colleges in PA with relatively low tuitions, so the VP can really highlight why our plan is better.

* High number of part-time students, so we can talk about how our package helps working Americans go back to school part-time to get the skills they need to succeed in the workplace.

2. Univ. of Connecticut at Tolland County

* 4 year public with high tuition, again showing benefits of 20% tax credit

* Community college is close by with reasonable, but not low tuition costs, so this would show HOPE well (but not as well as PA)

3. Univ. of Louisville, KY --

* 4 year public univ. is higher than other states with low cost community colleges

* there are community colleges close by with low tuiton costs, so we could highlight HOPE Scholarships and isn't terrible on 20% tax credit

* Friendly Governor who would like us to do an education event

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Roger V. Salazar (CN=Roger V. Salazar/O=OVP [OVP])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JUL-1997 15:36:53.00

SUBJECT: Remarks of the VP -- Center for National Policy 7/9

TO: Dorothy Drengler (CN=Dorothy Drengler/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
---------------------- Forwarded by Roger V. Salazar/OVP on 07/10/97 03:35

PM ---------------------------

Roger V. Salazar

07/09/97 04:35 PM

To: Elizabeth R. Newman @ EOP, Ricardo M. Gonzales @ EOP, Julie E. Mason @ eop, April Mellody @ eop, Darby E. Stott @ eop, Julia R. Green @ eop, Laura D. Schwartz @ eop, Joshua Silverman @ EOP, Eric Schnure @ OVP @ EOP, Dan Pink @ OVP @ EOP, Jonathan Spalter @ OVP @ EOP, David Thomas @ OVP @ EOP, Michael B. Feldman/OVP, Eli G. Attie/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Lori E. Abrams @ eop, Lori Anderson @ eop, Brenda M. Anders @ eop, David S. Beaubaire @ eop, Marsha E. Berry @ eop, Laura Capps @ eop, Steven A. Cohen @ eop, Michelle Crisci @ eop, Carolyn Curiel @ eop, Suzanne Dale @ eop, Lanny J. Davis @ eop, Marilyn DiGiacobbe @ EOP, James A. Dorskind @ eop, James T. Edmonds @ eop, Anne M. Edwards @ eop, Rahm Emanuel @ eop, Karen E. Finney @ eop, Jay K. Footlik @ eop, Ben A. Freeland @ eop, Jeremy M. Gaines @ eop, Michael A. Gill @ OVP @ EOP, Adam W. Goldberg @ eop, Jason S. Goldberg @ EOP, Donald Goldberg @ eop, Lawrence J. Haas/OMB/EOP @ EOP, Richard Hayes @ eop, Russell W. Horwitz @ eop, Brian J. Johnson @ eop, David E. Kalbaugh @ EOP, Angus S. King @ eop, Joshua A. King @ eop, Nicholas B. Kirkhorn @ eop, Catherine T. Kitchen @ eop, Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP @ EOP, Heidi Kukis @ OVP @ EOP, Sara M. Latham @ eop, G N. Lattimore @ eop, Patricia F. Lewis @ eop, Gordon Li @ eop, Michael D. Malone @ eop, Laura S. Marcus @ eop, Doris O. Matsui @ eop, Andrew J. Mayock @ eop, Anne E. McGuire @ eop, Cheryl D. Mills @ eop, Megan C. Moloney @ eop, Kevin Moran @ eop, Jonathan Murchinson @ eop, Peter R. Orszag @ eop, Carole A. Parmelee @ eop, Sally P. Paxton @ eop, Jonathan Prince @ eop, Peter O'Keefe @ EOP, Stuart Schear @ eop, Douglas S. Sheorn @ eop, David Shipley @ eop, Jake Siewert @ eop, Richard Socarides @ EOP, Douglas B. Sosnik @ eop, Todd Stern @ eop, Sylvia M. Mathews @ eop, Lisa Tamagni @ eop, Virginia M. Terzano @ ovp @ eop, terri tingen @ eop, Barry J. Toiv @ EOP, Jodie R. Torkelson @ EOP, June G. Turner @ eop, Dag Vega @ eop, Lorraine A. Voles @ ovp @ eop, Michael Waldman @ eop, Angelina Walker @ ovp @ eop, Teresa Wildman @ eop, SUNTUM_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, COGDELL_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, MCHUGH_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY, BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, BARTHOLOW_T @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, BLINKEN_A @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, CAPLAN_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, FULLER_W @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, GRIBBEN_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, HAAS_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, HERMAN_A @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, JOHNSON_DT @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, JOHNSON_WC @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, LIZIK_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, MOFFETT_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, NAPLAN_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, RILEY_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, SAMBURG_T @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, SCHAEFER_V @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, SHEPARD_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, STUMPF_D @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, SULLIVAN_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, WEINER_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, WOZNIAK_N @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, usia01 @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY, 1=US @ 2=WESTERN UNION @ 3= @ 5=ATT.COM @ *ELN\62955104 @ MRX @ LNGTWY, 62955104 @ eln.attmail.com @ INET @ LNGTWY, 73030.21 @ compuserve.com @ INET @

LNGTWY, INFOMGT @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, newsdesk @ usnewswire.com @ INET @ LNGTWY, usnwire @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY, CONUS @ 3479881 @ fax, associated press @ 7769575 @ fax, reuters @ 8988401 @ fax, upi @ 8988057 @ fax, la times @ 8871050 @ fax, new york times @ 8620340 @ fax, usa today @ 17032766585 @ fax, wsj @ 8629266 @ fax, washpost @ 4963936 @ fax, abc @ 2227684 @ fax, abcwh @ 2226681 @ fax, cbs @ 6387739 @ fax, cbswh @ 3311765 @ fax, cnn @ 8987565 @ fax, cnnwh @ 6381967 @ fax, cspan @ 7376226 @ fax, nbc @ 3622009 @ fax, nbcwh @ 8854460 @ fax, fox @ 8246426 @ fax, cnnwh @ 8987943 @ fax, El Nuevo Herald @ 13053762378 @ fax, La Opinion @ 6621245 @ fax, El Diario - La Prensa @ 12128074705 @ fax, Eastern Group Publications @ 12132639169 @ fax, Diario Las Americas @ 13056357668 @ fax, El Nuevo Dia @ 6627361 @ fax, VIVA @ 12129830323 @ fax, San Juan Star @ 4085950 @ fax, La Prensa @ 12102427901 @ fax, La Voz De Houston @ 17136644414 @ fax, El Hispano @ 12143572195 @ fax, Vista @ 13054437650 @ fax, Hispanic Magazine @ 17037800057 @ fax, Hispanic Link @ 2344090 @ fax, CBSTelenoticias @ 3712014 @ fax, Univision @ 7376039 @ fax, UPI Americas Radio @ 8988147 @ fax, CNNRadioNoticias @ 8273181 @ fax, CadenaRadioCentro @ 14044635724 @ fax, Hispanic Radio Network @ 15059826889 @ fax, RadioBilingue @ 12122649309 @ fax, Spanish Information Service @ 12142980799 @ fax, Latino USA @ 15124716178 @ fax, NAHP @ 6627254 @ fax

cc:

Subject: Remarks of the VP -- Center for National Policy 7/9

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Vice President

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE CONTACT: (202)

456-7035

Wednesday, July 9, 1997

Remarks of Vice President Al Gore

Center for National Policy

Washington, DC

July 9, 1997

One hundred and sixty-five years ago, Alexis de Tocqueville journeyed to a new world. For nine months, he traveled the United States from top to bottom and back again -- seeking to discover what made America unique at that time, and perhaps for all time. He visited our nation's capital, sixteen states, and the uncharted wilderness of the Michigan Territory.

He talked to farmers tilling small plots of land, and workers laboring in early factories.

What he saw was a young country beginning an historic transformation -- from the age of agriculture to the age of industry, from an old economy to a new one. But what amazed him more than any single sight was the spirit of a people in the midst of what could have been a terrifying change. Because, instead of retreat or resignation, Tocqueville saw relentless courage and infectious optimism.

And he returned to his native France to proclaim that the new American nation was, to use his phrase, "filled with promise." America -- in the words of his contemporary Ralph Waldo Emerson -- was "the land of tomorrow."

Now, I'm no Tocqueville. But in April, I decided to set out on a journey of my own. For the past three months, I have traveled America to witness something new -- to see an old economy once again giving way to a new one. During these three months, I have seen the new economy unfold in mammoth airplane hangars in Seattle, in the sunny cornfields of Iowa, on the streets of inner-city Detroit, in the high-tech labs of New England, and even in the far reaches of cyberspace.

I have seen the new economy -- an economy driven by information, research, knowledge, and technology. A new economy that values the productive capacity of people above all else. A new economy linked to a global marketplace that zaps dollars, deutschemarks, and data around the world at the speed of light. A new economy that brings the promise of a better life for all Americans.

I have discovered many things on my journey, and have as many questions as I have answers, but one thing ,s for sure: this is not your father ,s economy. The new economy is workers who learn throughout a lifetime, not those with a single skill. It is entrepreneurs who take risks, not managers who take a pass. It is economic growth because of environmental protection -- not in spite of it. The new economy is networked, not hierarchical. Distributed, not top-down. Creative, not complacent. Multicolored, not single-hued. It thrives on reinvention, not bureaucracy. It focusses on results, not red-tape. It is customized, not standardized. It is bits, more than brawn. Wits, more than widgets. Wired, not tired. Partnership, not confrontation. The new economy is hyperlinked, hyperspeed, hypertext, and at times just plain hyper.

And as I've talked to the Americans who are building this new economy, I have seen an America like the one Tocqueville saw -- a nation filled with promise. And I have seen an America that, in Emerson ,s wonderful phrase, has reclaimed its position as the land of tomorrow. And I ,ve seen Americans do all this with the same relentless courage and infectious optimism of their forebears.

For the last several months, across America, I have seen the new economy -- and I am here to tell you that it works.

I have seen the new economy at the New England Development Center of the Oracle Corporation in Nashua, New Hampshire. Two hundred brand new high-paying jobs on the cutting-edge of the Information Age. In a workplace that treats employees as assets to be developed rather than costs to be cut, the men and women of Oracle are building new low-cost, highly-efficient machines to cruise the information superhighway.

I have seen the new economy in North Carolina, where I've met with entrepreneurs, engineers, and venture capitalists who are inventing new technologies, new ways to structure business, even entirely new industries -- generating enormous wealth and setting the standard for the entire world.

I have seen the new economy on my own personal computer at a web site called Parent Soup. Parent Soup is a virtual community of parents, a thriving business that could not exist without the Internet. And it shows that the changes of the new economy go beyond just the way we do business. Parent Soup is just one example of how the new economy is changing almost every aspect of how we work and live.

But make not mistake about it: the new economy is not just computers -- it is taking root in every sector of our economy. The way every American works is changing -- must change -- to adapt to the opportunities and demands inherent in the new economy. I have seen that on the factory floor of Munoz Manufacturing in Detroit, Michigan -- a resurgent metropolis that is a far cry from the outpost Tocqueville described as a &fine American village 8 and a far cry from the devastation which followed the exodus of the auto-industry in the 1960s and 70s. With Empowerment Zones, the forces that shape the new economy are being used to lift up areas that once faced a bleak curtain of despair. With the support of the automobile industry which has come back to Detroit, Munoz Manufacturing is returning jobs and hope to the heart of a great city - by responding to the entrepreneurship incentives and tax relief of our Empowerment Zone program. They are proving that the new economy can be everybody's economy.

I have seen the new economy in Johnston, Iowa - at Pioneer Hi-Bred, a company that is marrying our oldest industry with our newest science. At Pioneer, genetic engineers are developing new seeds to grow sturdier crops our farmers can then export to the world. And just as important, Pioneer is rated one of the fifteen finest corporate citizens in the entire country. This successful company is showing that treating workers and the environment right is smart business in the new economy.

I have seen the new economy in Atlanta, at the Delta International Air Cargo Terminal - where goods made in America are being exported to consumers on every continent -- and where the benefits of free and fair trade are lifting the lives of middle-class Americans.

I have seen the new economy take hold in New Castle, Pennsylvania, the home of Berner International - a company run by one of the winners of the Small Businessperson of the Year award, Gloria Berner. This one-time English literature major runs a business that makes heavy equipment -- and steady profits. The new economy is no longer an old boys club. Today, women-owned businesses employ more people than the entire Fortune 500 combined. Women owned business are increasing at twice the rate of businesses generally. This is definitely not your father ,s economy.

I have seen the new economy in a gargantuan hangar of the Boeing plant I visited in Seattle. There, unionized workers are building the Triple Seven - the jet that will fly us into the next century. Teams of highly-skilled workers have been empowered to act quickly on their own, free from chain-of-command second-guessing.

How did all this happen? How did this new economy come to be? There are two main answers. One is that Americans worked hard. They shed old ways of thinking, retooled ailing industries, and invented new products, new services, new ways to do business.

But the other reason is that President Clinton put in place an economic strategy that was based on a solid understanding of what was new about the new economy. Our economic strategy combined three elements never before tried in collaboration.

First, reduce the budget deficit. Forget the gold standard, the new economy operates on the information standard. Financial markets around the world make and execute decisions about a government ,s fiscal policies every day in millions of transactions. If investors believe you , re playing games with the budget, or using smoke and mirrors, interest rates will climb almost instantly. The future implications of policy changes are judged in the present -- and so reducing the deficit is the most potent way of keeping interest rates in check and freeing capital for new enterprises.

The second part of our strategy: invest in education and technology -- because in the new economy, education is the key to opportunity and innovation opens the door to higher levels of productivity.

The third component of our new strategy: open new markets for America's goods. In our first term, the Clinton/Gore Administration hammered out more than 200 new trade agreements to bring down tariffs on American products.

Enacting this three-part strategy of lower deficits, investments in our productive capacity, and free and fair trade was certainly not easy. Every element of our strategy faced stiff and organized opposition from those who either didn ,t understand the new economy -- or who understood it and wanted to hold it back. In 1993, our budget plan passed by a single vote in the House -- and a single, tie-breaking vote in the Senate. Some courageous members of Congress even lost their seats doing the right thing. It was hard. In 1995 and 96, the other party shut down the government rather than agree to the strategic investments we believed the new economy demanded. And on trade -- NAFTA, GATT, and all of those other agreements -- we rejected the advice of those in both parties who said we should build walls around the old economy instead of bridges to the new, global economy.

Each time we tried to ready Americans of this century for the economy of the next century, we faced resistance. We heard a chorus predicting gloom and doom if we carried out our plan. Each time we tried to introduce a new way of thinking about the economy, we had to break through the din of special interests and take our case directly to the American people. Each time, for every part of our plan, it was a fight -- a knock-down, drag-out, bare-knuckled fight to the finish.

In spite of a few scars and bruises, I am proud to say these were fights well worth waging. Halfway through 1997, the evidence is in. The American economy is the strongest in a generation, the envy of the world. We don ,t endorse their phrase, but Fortune magazine wrote recently that it is not only the best economy in a generation, but the best ever in American history. In any case, we ,ve had the creation of 12.5 million new jobs. The growth rate close to 6 percent -- the highest in a decade. Consumer confidence stands at a 28-year high. The welfare rolls are down 3.1 million. After a long decline, incomes across the spectrum are finally ticking upward. The unemployment rate at historic lows -- just five percent last month -- and with none of this triggering inflation.

When the President and I came to office, the United States was experiencing stagnant job growth. Each time the economy was close to climbing out of its rut, businesses trying to borrow ran smack into a government trying to finance its enormous, nearly $300 billion annual deficits. That pushed interest rates higher -- and shoved the nation back into a recession. Back then the question before us was: How can we lift the economy out of its rut for good and get America back on track?

When the dust cleared from all those fights, our new economic strategy answered that question loudly and clearly.

Four and a half years later, as we enter the first summer of our second term, and the American economy is again the world ,s powerhouse, we face a new question: whether we can consolidate our gains and make sure this new economy continues to take root. Are we going to continue to press forward and bring all Americans into the new economy? Or are we going to creep backward into the destructive comfort of the status quo? That is the choice we face today. Reduced to three words, the choice is this: forward or back?

That is the central question Congress faces as it returns to Washington this week to begin work on taxes, the budget, and trade. As we evaluate each initiative, we must apply the same standard: does this help Americans like the ones I've met over the last few months prosper in the new economy? Does it move America forward? Or does it tug us backward?

The next 90 days will determine the answer. In the next 90 days, Congress will decide whether to continue a three-part economic strategy that recognizes what ,s new about the new economy, and that equips all Americans to prosper in a time of exhilarating change.

The first part of our strategy has been cutting the run-away deficit we inherited. Already, because of the plan we fought to pass in 1993, and because we refused to turn back in 1995, the deficit has gone down 77 percent. Now we have to finish the job. We need to balance the budget -- and do it in a way that continues to support the new economy. After long and difficult negotiations, we reached a bi-partisan agreement to balance the budget. A balanced budget -- the first in a generation -- would mean we could continue the low interest rates which have freed up the capital needed by entrepreneurs to invest in the firms of the future.

And yet, believe it or not, there are those in Congress who oppose the balanced budget agreement. Some say the spending cuts are too deep; others say the tax cuts are too small. And voices can now be heard saying that our incredible progress in reducing the deficit should excuse us from taking the last steps to get that deficit down to zero. Now that the pressure ,s on and it ,s time for tough decisions, we must accept responsibility and embrace the lessons of the new economy. Now is not the time to pull back from the hard decisions and refuse to recognize that a new economy calls for new policies.

And now is not the time to heed the calls of those who say the budget will balance itself. Hoping the budget will balance itself is not the answer. The only answer is to make hard choices, pass a credible plan, continue on course, and eliminate the deficit.

As we balance the budget, we must also continue to transform the federal government. But new ideas must be implemented in new ways. Over the past decade, American business has changed the way it does business. It has emphasized choice, quality, and efficiency. All around America, companies large and small have stopped doing "business as usual." And in the past four years and a half years, this Administration has stopped doing "government as usual." Our Reinventing Government initiative is one of the reasons we have the ability to both balance the budget and still increase our investments into the future. We have cut 300,000 government employees from the federal workforce and are getting rid of 16,000 pages of unnecessary regulations. But even more importantly we have changed the way government views its role. We ,re listening to federal employees and following their ideas. Once the focus was on filling out paperwork and making sure forms were done in triplicate -- today the focus is on serving the customer and offering them choices.

I ,m pleased that both houses of Congress having been moving ahead on a balanced budget. Now, the Congress and the White House must work together to produce a conference agreement that is consistent with the Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement and put the final nail in the coffin of fiscal irresponsibility. We cannot build the new economy on a foundation of hot checks. Those who oppose a balanced budget and refuse to make cuts in spending are refusing to give the new economy the breathing room it needs to grow.

At the same time we must also continue with the second part of our strategy: investments in the future. These are needed to give the new economy the energy it needs to grow. We should reject the views of those who say that a balanced budget and the lower interest rates it brings will be enough by themselves to build our new economy. For in the new economy, the true engines of growth are ideas -- and the technology and higher productivity created by those ideas.

That is why we need to make the priority investments the new economy demands. Investments in education, technology, and the environment. The budget agreement calls for the largest increase in our commitment to education in a generation -- by increasing Pell Grants, by making sure that our schools meet the highest world class standards, by deploying an army of a million reading tutors for our children, and by reforming the public school system so that it follows the model of decentralization and choice epitomized by the vanguard companies of the new economy. And because technology is always changing and the science and technology revolution is still accelerating, we need to continue to increase our investment in research and development. Ideas, innovations, and inventions are the forces moving the new economy. And unless we help them along, the new economy will pass us by. Our willingness to make investments like these created a vibrant middle class, built the federal interstate, and even today is taking us to Mars. Abandoning these investments now will keep too many Americans stuck on the launch pad of the new economy.

We need to invest in America, but we also have to make it easier to let Americans invest in themselves. The answer to the challenges we face is not just more spending, but equipping citizens to master their own destinies -- trusting Americans to make the right decisions for themselves. And that ,s why the President put forward a tax cut plan last week that is built around the idea of Americans getting ready for the opportunities of the new economy.

At the moment there are three tax packages on the table for the American people to consider -- the President ,s plan, and the plans passed by the two branches of Congress. Each contains different priorities, each has a different vision for America ,s future, each responds differently to the challenges presented by the new economy.

Well, I have seen the Republican tax proposals -- and I am here to tell you they don ,t work.

Where the President ,s plan treats education as a necessity, the Republican plans see it as a luxury -- a nice little bonus to add onto your resume, if you can afford it. Perhaps they don ,t understand the new economy, or perhaps they just don ,t understand what it means to the nation. But by the year 2000, a little more than two years from now, more than 60 percent of jobs in America will require the use of information technology -- and a high school education just will not be enough. We need to make sure that every young person is ready for the future.

That ,s why the President has included the HOPE Scholarship in his tax cut plan -- a real HOPE Scholarship providing a real hope for those that desperately want to go to college and want to swim with the rising tide of the new economy. The Republican plans provide some support for the first two years of college, but not enough to make their HOPE Scholarship more than a mirage. In between all of the percentage signs and decimal points of their plan, hope is lost and so is the promise of the new economy.

And unlike the Republican plan, ours offers help to students in all four years of college, including graduate education beyond that. But it ,s not just the young. In the new economy, education is becoming part of the working day of every American. That's why one of the most important differences between our tax cut plan and the congressional plan is in how we view lifetime learning. Their view of the economy is mired in the forgotten past of a day when employers thought a worker ,s education was likely to get in the way. The new economy is different because it is a learning economy. A flexible and engaged mind is as important today as a strong back and a sturdy work ethic were in earlier generations. Every job requires workers to constantly upgrade their skills. Technology is changing so fast that manuals are obsolete before their ink dries.

Unlike the Republican plan, ours therefore has a 20 percent tuition tax credit that provides support for Americans to learn throughout their lives. Our plan excludes employer provided education benefits from taxation and has a 10 percent employer credit for training in small businesses, the lifeblood of the new economy. Today, you are never old enough to stop learning. We have to recognize that in the America of the new economy, the more we know, the more we grow.

Tax cuts are good for America -- but there is a right way and a wrong way to go about it. The Republican tax cuts cut too many Americans out of the new economy and tax the patience of families that are trying to get ahead.

Another way our tax cut plan provides critical support for the new economy is through our targeted small business capital gains tax incentive. This will help small technology companies raise capital more easily. Under our plan, investments in companies with assets of up to $100 million will be eligible for reduced taxes on capital gains. These small start-ups provide the energy and vigor of the new economy -- they are the laboratories where the land of tomorrow is now being born. This kind of capital gains tax cut will help more start-ups get off the ground, and ensure that America continues to lead the world in high technology.

And, of course, we must invest in the environment. We have to protect our environment and make the investments necessary to keep our air and water clean and safe. Because, in the new economy, protecting the environment is not a sacrifice we make by slowing the economy, it is a precondition for a growing economy.

Investing in the new economy -- by using the tools of both the budget and tax cuts -- has been, and will continue to be, the key to our success. And our investments in education, technology, and the environment have responded to the new economy in a way that recognizes that the world has changed. The old debates of the extremes of both ends of the political spectrum just don ,t make a whole lot of sense anymore.

On one hand, there are those who criticize the budget for cutting spending too much. Their vision seems to be one of a large, centralized government protecting Americans from any adversity and proposing a program for every problem.

On the other hand there are those who criticize this budget for cutting spending too little. Their vision seems to be one of almost no government -- where every American is on their own and Washington ,s only job is to get out of the way.

Well, both are wrong. Their debate is straight out of the 1930s. Its irrelevant to the new economy. Americans in the new economy don ,t want government to be our nanny or a deadbeat dad. What we want is government to be our partner -- not to do things for us and not to leave us twisting in the wind, but to help empower us do things ourselves. That , s what our investments are all about.

Government should neither hold our hand and nor give us the back of the hand. But, in the new economy, government must give us a hand in building a better future.

This was the vision of government we set forth in 1993, the vision we defended in 1995. Today, the lines of battle are being drawn again. Listen carefully and you will here the huffing and puffing of out-of-shape and out-of-date dogmas trying to keep up with the dynamism of the new economy. The new economy has trumped old politics time and time again. The fights on the budget and taxes will show whether we will face the new economy with courage -- or flinch from it in fear.

Once it finishes hashing out the budget and tax plans, I expect Congress will turn its attention to addressing the third element of our economic strategy: our commitment to free and fair trade. Our administration will press the Congress for fast-track authority to expand free trade, particularly in this hemisphere. And once again, we must insist that they look at this issue through the prism of the new economy. Because the new economy is a global economy, woven to the world. That is an undeniable truth. The workers at Boeing know it, the workers at Munoz Manufacturing know it. Now, we need to make sure our elected representatives in the Congress know it.

President Clinton and I fought hard to open foreign markets to U.S. products with some 200 trade agreements. But each time, we faced resistance - from those who believed we'd reach prosperity by building walls instead of bridges. Each time there was a fight.

The fight continues today. If protectionism was wrong in the Industrial Age, it is just plain dangerous in the Information Age. At a time when knowledge is the most important component of national success, America -- the land of innovation -- should embrace free and fair trade with open arms. At a time when we trade in goods and services with every corner of the globe, America -- the most diverse nation the world has ever known -- has a comparative advantage the rest of the world could only dream of. And at a time when people around the world watch our movies and our TV shows and listen to our music, America -- the superpower of creativity -- is looked to for leadership and inspiration. This is one area where America, in Tocqueville ,s phrase, is truly filled with promise. Protectionism risks draining that promise away.

And yet even today, with the new economy a fact of all of our lives, there are those who subscribe to the mistaken belief that building fences tall enough will keep change away -- and keeping change away will make America more prosperous. This philosophy hinges on the belief that American workers and American entrepreneurs aren't as good as the rest of the world -- and need to be protected by a benevolent government. That is just manifestly wrong. In my journey to see the new economy, I found an America that has shown itself to be the most creative, most innovative, most productive economy in the world -- and that didn't happen because of government protections. Done right, with agreements that safeguard the environment and the rights of workers, trade can lead us to a more prosperous tomorrow.

The new economy is all around us. Ask the auto mechanic who works on cars like the Ford Taurus, a car that has more electronic equipment than the lunar landing module that took men to the moon. Ask the nurse who relies on computers to track records and monitor patients. Ask the kids who chuckle to think that there was a time before ATMs and cable TV. And then chuckle yourself for thinking about how their kids will laugh at a time before videoconferencing and auto-pilot cars were standard. We truly are the land of tomorrow.

Just as the past 90 days have helped me to articulate my vision of the new economy, the next 90 days will shape our nation ,s response to the new economy. And as I said earlier, buried in the all the talk of resolutions and reconciliation, hidden amid the distributional tables, between the lines of the footnotes to all the fine print there is a simple question: forward or back? Will we renew the economic strategy forged in 1993 or veer off to follow the sirens , song of the extremes? Will we embrace the new economy or try to recreate an obsolete past? Soon all these questions will have answers. We must choose wisely. We ,ve done it before, we can do it again.

###

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Eric R. Anderson (CN=Eric R. Anderson/O=OVP [OVP])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-SEP-1997 11:34:31.00

SUBJECT: Maryland briefing

TO: Nicholas R. Baldick (CN=Nicholas R. Baldick/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Ellen asked me to forward this to you. It's what we gave the VP for his trip yesterday.

Maryland Background

September 4, 1997 (Prepared by Nick Baldick, Eric Anderson and Chris Swift)

PRIOR VISIT

According to our records, your last official trip to Maryland was July 1, 1997, where you spoke at the kick-off of the Baltimore History Bicentennial Passport program with Mayor Schmoke. That evening, you attended a DNC dinner in your honor at the McManus residence.

POLITICAL

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION RESULTS

1992		1996
Clinton/Gore	988,571 50%	

Clinton/Gore 966,207 54%

Bush/Quayle 707,094 36%

Dole/Kemp 681,530 38%

Perot/Stockdale 281,414 14%

Perot/Choate 115,812 7%

CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS/LEGISLATIVE LEADERSHIP

Governor: Parris Glendening (D)

Lt. Governor: Kathleen Kennedy Townsend (D)

Attorney General: Joseph Curran, Jr. (D)

State Comptroller: Lewis L. Goldstein (D)

Senate President: Thomas V. Mike Miller, Jr. (D)

Senate President Pro-Tem: Clarence Blount (D)

Senate Minority Leader: Vernon Boozer (R)

House Speaker: Casper R. Taylor, Jr. (D)

House Majority Leader: John A. Harsen (D)

House Minority Leader: Robert Kittlenan (R)

U.S Senate: Sen. Paul Sarbanes (D) 59% in 1994

Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D) 71% in 1992

U.S. House: 4D/4R

State Senate: 32D/15R

General Assembly: 100D/41R

Electoral Votes: 10

1996 STATE ELECTION RESULTS

Clinton/Gore +96 captured 54.3% of Maryland,s popular vote, the second largest percentage for a Democratic presidential candidate in 56 years, while increasing the margin of victory in the state by 4% from 1992. Clinton/Gore +96 did especially well in the City of Baltimore as well as Baltimore, Prince George,s, Dorchester, Howard, Kent, Montgomery, and Sommerset counties. The large margins of victory in the Baltimore-Washington I-95 corridor off set the losses in the less populous Western Maryland and Eastern Shore counties. The Democrats failed to pick up any congressional seats in the 1996 election, but successfully held their four seats.

CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Sen. Paul Sarbanes (D) Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D)

Rep. Wayne Gilchrest (R-01) Rep. Bob Ehrlich (R-02)

Rep. Ben Cardin (D-03) Rep. Albert Wynn (D-04)

Rep. Steny Hoyer (D-05) Rep. Roscoe Bartlett (R-06)

Rep. Elijah Cummings (D-07) Rep. Connie Morella (R-08)

1998 GOVERNOR,S RACE

Despite his incumbent status, Governor Glendening is seen by many as extremely vulnerable in his +98 reelection bid. After his narrow 1994 victory (6,000 votes) Glendening has been plagued by problems--including an investigation into the election itself--that has dropped his approval rating below 30% in the summer of 1996. Since October 1996, Glendening has improved his public standing by fighting a heated gambling battle, pushing for an income tax cut, and working to improve education. Despite sweeping legislative successes in these areas, many speculate that Glendening may not receive credit for his recent achievements. Glendening is also gearing up for the 1998 race by launching a fundraising operation which has already netted over $1 million.

To further his reelection hopes, Glendening has sought to ward off possible primary challenges by winning the early endorsement of six Baltimore City Senators, scheduling numerous fundraisers for the summer, and, according to The Baltimore Sun, criss-crossing the state &with the energy of a driven man down in the polls.8 Despite his efforts, Glendening,s damaged reputation has already prompted a challenge from Hartford County Exec. Eileen Rehrmann (D). Rehrmann announced her candidacy in an unusually low-key style, releasing the text of a letter she mailed to 4,000 supporters throughout the state. Rehrmann may have difficulty raising the funds needed to topple Glendening.

As reported yesterday in The Washington Post, Maryland Congressman Benjamin L. Cardin announced that he will not run for Governor. A six-term member of the House of Representatives, Cardin reportedly decided not to enter the Democratic primary because he believes he can better serve Marylanders in Congress. A copy of the Post article is attached.

The other name mentioned as a possible Democratic primary challenger is Speaker of the House of Delegates Cas Taylor (D). While still a viable candidate, Taylor could be hindered by his limited base of support and by his difficulties in pushing his agenda this Legislative session. In all likelihood, Glendening would survive a primary challenge by Rehrmann or Taylor, but a Cardin-Glendening primary battle would be very tight.

1994 Republican gubernatorial nominee Ellen Sauerbrey (R) formally announced her candidacy at an April 30th fundraiser attended by Steve Forbes. Other leading Republicans such as Dan Quayle, Jack Kemp and former Reagan aide Lyn Nofziger have also attended fundraisiers for her. Sauerbrey will face a primary challenge from Howard County Executive Chuck Ecker (R). Sauerbrey could be haunted in the election by the outrageous cries of fraud she made following the 1994 election. Sauerbrey,s spiteful, bordering on obsessive, attacks against Glendening after the race dropped her approval ratings in 1996. Because the closed Republican primary is dominated by the party,s far right, the conservative Sauerbrey will likely defeat the moderate Ecker, despite her damaged reputation. However, if Ecker is able to emerge victorious from the GOP primary, he will present a formidable challenge to the Democratic candidate. The Democratic nominee would most likely be a slight favorite against Saucerbrey because of her very conservative views and marred image.

1998 SENATE RACE

Senator Mikulski is seeking reelection to a third term in 1998. She won election to a second term in 1992 with 71% of the vote and should easily win reelection in 1998. Her approval rating has been consistently in the mid 60's during the last three years. According to the December 31, 1996, FEC report, Mikulski had $561,585 on hand, and you attended a fundraiser for her on April 13th in Baltimore. Due to her popularity in Maryland, a Republican challenger has yet to surface. For 1998, Republicans have wisely chosen to focus their attention on unseating Governor Glendening rather than wasting their effort against Mikulski.

2000 SENATE RACE

Baltimore Mayor Kurt Schmoke stated on April 17th that he will make a bid for the U.S. Senate in 2000 if Senator Sarbanes decides not to run for reelection. Sarbanes had to be convinced to run in 1994, but he has shown what many consider renewed vigor and visibility recently. Many observers have speculated that Schmoke would seek the seat in 2000, but this was the first time the Mayor actually stated his intentions.

HOT ISSUES

New Maryland Democratic Party Chair. Former Governor Harry Hughes formally stepped down as Democratic Party Chair on June 7th. Governor Glendening tapped Peter Krauser, the party,s second vice-chair and the former President of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, to succeed Hughes. Ann MacKinnon was named the new executive director of MD Democratic Party on June 5th. MacKinnon--a close Glendening alley--currently serves as a member of the Prince George,s County Council.

Nearly 99% of Seniors Meet Service Standard. In 1992 the State Board of Education made 75 hours of community service a graduation requirement. Of this year,s high school graduating class, only 49 of the more than 450,000 public high school seniors did not graduate because they failed to complete the community service requirement. Many educators had assumed that students would complete the requirement on their own initiative, because last year 40 % of the state,s seniors had not completed the mandatory service hours. Since then, school systems across the state have worked furiously to create courses and strategies to assist the students. Maryland,s high school volunteer requirements, the only one of its kind in the nation, were praised by the President at the Summit for America,s future in Philadelphia.

1997 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

As alluded to earlier, Governor Glendening enjoyed a particularly successful legislative session, with major victories in education, taxes, and gambling. However, the Governor did suffer a significant set back when his HOPE Scholarship failed to win support.

Income Tax Cut. The legislature passed, and the Governor signed, a 10% cut in the state income tax. The legislation reduces the tax rate over the next five years from 5% to 4.75% and increases the personal exemption from $1,200 to $2,400. Although very popular with the public, some state legislators believe the State cannot afford it. The Governor plans to pay for this tax cut with surplus revenue and spending cuts. Governor Glendening has received praise for being one of the only Democratic Governors to implement such a plan.

Gambling. The legislature was considering a bill allowing gambling in the state, but the legislation was blocked by the Governor. Most legislators were in favor of some form of gambling but were uncertain of the parameters. Governor Glendening is adamantly opposed to gambling and has made this a very public battle. Glendening,s mantra on this issue has been, &No Slots. No Casinos. No Exceptions!8 It should be noted that Glendening was able to prevail on the issue despite the fact that the gambling lobby spent $1 million during the General Assembly,s ninety-day session.

Baltimore Mayor Schmoke sent a letter to Glendening on May 21st asking him to reconsider his anti-gambling stance. Schmoke, who opposes complete legalization of gambling, is pushing for expanded gaming at Pimlico Race Track to stem the tide of tourist dollars crossing the boarder into Delaware. Schmoke,s position on gambling places Glendening in an extremely difficult position politically. Glendening has long been an ardent opponent of gambling and has organized much of his reelection effort around the issue. However, Glendening, who already faces an uphill fight, will have difficulty winning reelection without Schmoke,s backing.

Smart Growth. The Governor introduced a package of four environmental bills that cover a wide range of issues. The legislation, called Smart Growth, passed with the strong support of the environmental community. Specifically, this landmark legislation helps control suburban sprawl; works on directing resources to Smart Growth areas; will not unfairly penalize a potential developer for previous pollution on a site; and offers job creation tax credits to businesses which choose to locate or expand in designated growth areas. Previous Democratic governors had tried to pass similar legislation without success. As you recall, you praised Maryland,s Smart Growth program during Governor Glendening,s visit to the White House on May 29th.

Campaign Finance Reform. The Maryland legislature enacted significant campaign finance reform measures this session which will (1) computerize the campaign fundraising records of statewide officials by November 1997, and all state campaigns by 1999; (2) ban fundraising by members of the General Assembly and those seeking statewide office during the 90-day session; (3) require businesses granted contracts worth $100,000 or more to disclose contributions before any contract awards are approved.

Higher Education. The passage of the Governor,s Maryland Scholarship Loan Tuition Program will create a mechanism for parents to set aside money now to help pay for their child,s college tuition. This program will make it possible for parents to afford the cost of a college education without amassing a mountain of debt.

However, the Governor,s other higher education initiative, his Hope

Scholarship Program, was carried over to the next legislative session. The Governor was not able to get the votes for the bill while he was cutting taxes.

School Funding. The legislature passed an expanded education funding bill this session which settles a dispute over funding between the City of Baltimore and the state. Backed by city leaders and Governor Glendening, the legislation--which includes a five-year, $254 million rescue plan for Baltimore,s public schools--won narrow approval. Although the plan bails out the city,s troubled school system, Schmoke has been criticized for agreeing to turn power over to the state. The legislation also includes an additional $167 million in educational funding for the large suburban counties. Under the bill, funds for the other large counties are distributed based upon a complicated formula which measures the number of low income children per county.

The heated debate which plagued the education funding bill prompted a movement to reexamine and possibly change the way Maryland pays for pubic education. House Speaker Casper R. Taylor Jr. (D-Allegany) has said his top priority for next year,s session would be the development of a new funding program which would benefit low-income children in less urban counties. However, Senate President Mike Miller (D-Prince Georges) opposes the idea because he believes the state is already sending too much money back to the counties. The proposal for an in-depth study on school funding is currently stalled in the Legislature with leaders of both parties questioning the need for the effort.

GLENDENING,S ELECTION YEAR AGENDA

With the election looming, on June 24th Governor Glendening unveiled a relatively modest 1998 Legislative agenda. In a speech to the Maryland Municipal League,s annual convention, Glendening said he will again push his &Thriving by Three8 initiative. This proposal--which was shot down this year--seeks to add approximately $5 million in spending for low-income pregnant women and their babies. Glendening,s agenda also calls for an expanded recycling program, improving public school libraries, and for creating a program to help teachers attain voluntary national certification. Glendening said he would offer details on funding these programs at a later date. Glendening,s rather limited agenda--a significant departure from last year,s ambitious &smart growth8 proposal which sought to combat urban sprawl--is likely a reaction against the bruising +97 Legislative session.

BALTIMORE HOT ISSUES

Baltimore Police Racial Feud. At a meeting of African American officers on April 17th, Baltimore,s top ranking African American officer, Ronald L. Daniel, questioned City Police Commissioner Thomas C. Frazier,s commitment to ending racial disparity on the force and suggested a new chief might be needed if racial concerns were not addressed. Frazier responded by briefly suspending Daniel--accusing him of insubordination--and launching an investigation. Mayor Schmoke ordered an end to the fight and rescinded both the suspension and the investigation. Appearing before a joint news conference on April 25th, Frazier and Daniel publicly declared an end to the dispute that had fractured the department.

The truce was shattered on June 8th when Daniel charged that Frazier had harassed two black officers who supported him during the April upheaval. Daniel said he would no longer head an effort to implement racial reforms, a task assigned to him by Mayor Schmoke. Frazier retorted by issuing a statement claiming that he was &firmly committed to issues of internal equality. 8

On Wednesday, June 25th, Frazier released the results of the investigation he commissioned to examine charges of racial bias and discrimination on the force. The 109-page report concluded that the Baltimore police force has not carried out internal investigations with racial bias. The investigation revealed that in 152 disciplinary cases, half of the officers charged with violations were white and half were black. Although explicit discrimination was not found, the report did suggest possible changes. The report advocates the creation of a new standardized internal complaint procedure which would provide codified guide lines for dolling out punishment. The report also claimed that trial boards--groups of police officers who decide the merits of a misconduct case against fellow officers--should receive extensive training in legal issues. When asked for comment on the report, Officer Daniel said, &They haven ,t seen fit to give me a copy, and I ,m not sure they will. They don ,t want people to see this, because they don ,t want any type of critical analysis. 8

Baltimore Inner Harbor Development. In order to further develop the downtown, Baltimore needs a major four-star hotel to service the expanded convention center. The city agreed to provide $42 million in taxpayer subsidies, which making the hotel one of the largest publicly-supported downtown projects of the past 20 years. The city commissioned the now-defunct Legg Mason Realty Group to study Baltimore ,s hotel needs and accepted numerous development proposals. The report claimed that the city owned lots adjacent to Camden Yards, and across the street from the convention center, was the most suitable site for the new hotel. However, the mayor opted to accept a proposal--spearheaded by John Paterakis Sr., the owner of H&S Bakery and a supporter of the Mayor--to place a 750-room Wyndham hotel south of Little Italy. Schmoke has received fierce criticism for selecting the Wyndham proposal it is widely perceived as the design least likely to succeed.

Before the plans can proceed, the Wyndham proposal must first meet eight conditions (such as parking and design) set by the city ,s economic development agency, the Baltimore Development Corporation. Baltimore Development Corporation is expected to announce their decision on the Wyndham site on June 30th. If the Wyndham plan is rejected, the city will again accept bids. The city is also expected this week to formally request proposals on development of the Camden Yards site. A partnership led by Orioles owner Peter Angelos and the Hyatt Corporation has proposed a publicly funded 850-room hotel to be connected to the convention center by an enclosed walk way. Many question whether the city could either afford or sustain two huge new downtown hotels.

Baltimore City Park Conflict. Baltimore Recreation and Parks chief, Marlyn J. Perritt abruptly resigned on June 7th in the wake of controversy surrounding the city ,s park system. For months, Perritt has been publicly battered by the Mayor, City Council members, and residents who questioned her leadership of the troubled department. Perritt ,s problems came to a head last week when she threatened to close 40 of the city ,s 58 recreation centers because Schmoke had cut her department ,s budget by an unprecedented 17%. Schmoke overruled Perritt ,s decision to close the facilities and said that her department warranted an investigation into its operations and top management. Schmoke ,s criticism came on the heels of a scathing report from a task force which claimed that the recreation department squandered its money, was top heavy with managers, and had a lethargic management staff. Perritt ,s resignation ends a tenure with the city that was often plagued by conflict.

Schiller Named Chief of Baltimore School Board. Under this years economic bailout plan (discussed earlier), the city of Baltimore conceded power to the state by allowing it to appoint individuals to the Baltimore City School Board. On June 24th, the new School Board named Robert Schiller as its interim CEO. Schiller, who has served as deputy superintendent in both Louisiana and Delaware, will stay at the post until a permanent CEO can be found. He is expected to establish the school system ,s parental advisory board; merge the divided general education and special education services into a single administrative body; help negotiate a new contract for the district ,s 6,500 teachers; and replace members of the administrative staff who have retired or otherwise departed during the transition.

MARYLAND AT A GLANCE

1995 estimated population was 5,042,00.

70.8% of Maryland residents are White, 25.7% are African American, and 3.4% are Asian American.

11.3% of Maryland residents are age 65 or older.

The median household income is $39,198.

26.5% of Maryland residents have a college degree. 78.4% have a high school diploma.

In Maryland, 46.2% of the Voting Age Population (VAP) voted in the 1996 elections, compared with 61% of the VAP in 1994 and 53% of the VAP in 1992.

BALTIMORE AT A GLANCE

Baltimore has approximately 703,000 residents which is down 4.5% from 1990. 59.2% of Baltimore residents are African American and 40% are White and 1% are Asian. While the population of African Americans in the city has remained the same since 1970 it has increased in surrounding suburbs from 125,721 in 1980 to 179,450 in 1990. 13% of Baltimore residents are 65 or older. According to the Baltimore Sun, the Violent Crime rate has gone down nearly 20% for the first three months of 1997. The Baltimore Empowerment Zone has created 1,700 jobs and 26 new businesses. Clinton/Gore did very well in Baltimore winning the city with 75.8% in 1992 and 79.34% in 1996. This year Baltimore is celebrating its Bicentennial with parties and events planned throughout the year.

The city of Baltimore lies in the third and seventh Congressional

Districts which are represented by Ben Cardin (D-03) and Elijah Cummings (D-07). In 1996, Cardin defeated his GOP challenger Patrick L. McDonough (R), 67%-33% and Cummings beat Kenneth Kondner (R) 84%-17%.

APPOINTEES FROM MARYLAND

Name Title Agency/Dept

Norman R. Augustine Member Pres Cmte, Advisors on Sci & Tech

Lanny Davis Special Counsel The White House

Michael DiMario Public Printer of US Govt Printing Office

Stuart Eizenstat Under Secretary Department of State

Richard Klausner Director National Cancer Institute

Jacob Lew Deputy Director Office of Mgmt and Budget

Susan Liss Chief of Staff Mrs. Gore ,s Office

Mike McCurry Press Secretary The White House

Robert M. McGee Member Pres Comm on WH Fellowships

C. Thomas McMillan Co-Chair Pres Cnl on Phys Fitness & Sports

Doris Meissner Commissioner Immig & Naturalization Service

Richard Moe Member Cmte for Preservation of WH

George Tenet Director Central Intelligence